Boston University

SCHOOL OF
SOCIAL WORK

LIBRARY

Gift of

Author

Thesis
Knaggs
1942

6682-1

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

MASCULINITY AND FEMININITY IN CHILDREN OF FAMILIES CONTAINING ONE BOY AND ONE GIRL

A Thesis

13

Submitted by

Lewis Wellington Knaggs

(A.B., Bowling Green State University, 1939)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for

the Degree of Master of Science in Social Service

1942

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/masculinityfemin00knag

Approved by

First Reader Jeannette R. Greene

Second Reader Robert Wang

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I -	Introduction	
	Purpose of the Study	1
	Limitations of the Study	3
	Method of Study	4
II -	Masculinity and Femininity	7
III -	Illustrative Cases	
	Case One	15
	Case Two	21
	Case Three	25
	Case Four	29
	Case Five	34
	Case Six	38
IV -	The Study Group	42
V -	Results of the Study	51
VI -	Summary and Conclusions	61
Appendix		65
Bibliography		67

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I -	Ages of the Children	43
II -	The Referral Problems	46
III -	Masculinity and Femininity of the Study Group	51
IV -	Relationship of Parent-Dominancy to Masculinity and Femininity of Siblings	53
V -	Relationship of the Age Range Between the Siblings to Masculinity and Femininity	56
VI -	Relationship of the Age Range to the Sibling-Combinations	59

CHAPTER I

Purpose of the Study

One of the most difficult tasks facing any person who deals with human beings and their problems is that of taking a mass of apparently unrelated facts and impressions, weighing them and choosing from among them the pertinent factors, and welding those factors into a whole which defines the problem under consideration and indicates the bases underlying its formation. This task is called "diagnosis". To attempt to diagnose without making use of previous experience with similar situations is to flounder in the midst of uncertainties. To approach a particular problem with an understanding of what factors have had meaning in similar situations is to lend certainty and direction to the approach. Therefore, the greater the number of situations in which the similar important factors are analysed and synthesized into a whole that has meaning in a large proportion of other similar situations, the surer the approach to diagnosis will be. It is the author's hope that the present study will provide another of these guides by which diagnosis may be aided.

A few years ago, the well-known psychoanalyst, Dr. Helene Deutsch, stated in a lecture that, where there is only one boy and one girl in a family, they are likely to be con-

fused in regard to their sex roles: that is, the boy is likely to be effeminate and the girl masculine. In his work at a child guidance clinic the author worked with several such families in which the observation seemed to be true.

Despite a careful survey of the literature on psychosexual development, sibling rivalry, and related subjects, the author was unable to discover any report of a study of this matter or any specific statements either substantiating or refuting the observation. A great deal has been written about the only child, and the matter of the influence of a child's ordinal position on his development has been extensively studied, but apparently no one has investigated the possibility that one boy and one girl growing up without other siblings might become confused as to their roles. Because of the lack of any specific information on the subject, the author felt that it merited consideration.

The main purpose of this study, then, is to attempt to discover whether or not this observation is borne out by a critical analysis of a considerable number of family units including only one boy and one girl.

That this question is of some importance is attested by the fact that approximately fifteen per cent of the children referred to the Judge Baker Guidance Center during a two-year period were from families containing only one boy and one girl. It is not to be inferred, of course, that the problems for

which the children were referred necessarily developed as a result of the family configuration. However, if the observation that there is likely to be a confusion of sex in the children from these families is substantiated by the study, then this would afford an important diagnostic consideration in a considerable number of cases.

Besides the main consideration, the study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. Is the personalities of the parents a controlling factor?
2. Is there a difference according to which child is the older?
3. Is there a difference according to the age range between the children?
4. Is there a difference in homes from which one parent is absent because of death, divorce, or separation?

Limitations of the Study

In order to determine how applicable the results of the study may be to any given situation, it will be well to consider first the necessary limitations of the study. In the first place, the cases studied were from the files of a child guidance clinic, which means that the child referred presented behavior or personality problems, and was therefore not repre-

sentative of all children from this family type.

Also, the choice of cases was further limited by the following criteria: there must never have been another child in the family, whether adopted, boarded for a period of time, or an own child who had died or had been removed from the home. Both the children must have lived with at least one own parent all their lives, with the exception of short periods of time spent with relatives or in summer camps. When the child referred was first studied, the younger of the two children must have been at least six years of age, in order that the reaction patterns of the younger child would be sufficiently crystallized to indicate whether he were confused as to his sexual role. Finally, it was necessary that there be sufficient information on both children to enable the author to decide as to their masculinity or femininity.

Method of Study

The cases were chosen from those referred to the Judge Baker Guidance Center in the period between January 1, 1939, and January 1, 1941. During this period, one hundred four cases fulfilling the first three of the four criteria indicated in the above paragraph were referred to the Center. It had been the author's intention to study every other case, according to number, making a total of fifty-two cases. However, after studying a number of cases in this way, it was found that

some of them did not contain sufficient material on the sibling who was not referred. Therefore, it was necessary to study each case in order, and to select for consideration in this study only those which contained enough information on both siblings to warrant a decision as to their masculinity and femininity. The author proceeded in this way until fifty cases had been found which fulfilled all the criteria, and these fifty cases form the study group.

In analysing the case records a schedule was drawn up to serve as a guide in securing the information which the author thought necessary to indicate whether the child showed predominantly masculine or feminine traits.[1] The schedule provided for identifying data and information on the personalities of both parents and their attitudes toward each child. For each sibling, particular attention was paid to information pertaining to his health, adjustments to his sibling and to other children, interests and expressed ambitions, and adjustments to each parent. Observations made about the child by staff workers, parents, teachers, and others were carefully recorded.

Fortunately, the author was able to interview the social workers who had been, or were still at the time of the study, active in some of the cases, and thus was able to supplement the recorded material.

---

1 See Appendix for copy of Schedule.

It is evident that the validity of this study will depend to a considerable extent upon the nature of the criteria formulated by the author for judging masculine and feminine traits. The following chapter includes a discussion of masculinity and femininity in general, and of the criteria evolved for determining these traits in the fifty cases studied.

CHAPTER II

Masculinity and Femininity

"It's not good to have just one boy and one girl! The girl is more boy than the boy; the boy is more girl than the girl."

Thus one mother, speaking from her experience with her two children, summed up her feelings about the difficulties likely to result from having only one boy and one girl in a family. Her observation coincides with that of Dr. Deutsch, referred to above. The purpose of this study is to determine whether the observations of this mother and Dr. Deutsch are confirmed by a large group of similar family configurations.

The first obvious requisite is to establish some norms for judging masculine and feminine traits in boys and girls. At first thought this would seem to be a fairly simple undertaking. The biological world is made up of males and females, and apparently the biological characteristics of each group are easily distinguished. Since the beginning of literature the personality and behavior traits of the two sexes have been related in story, song, and poem, and it would seem that the delineation should be clear and concise. It should be possible to point to any aspect of behavior and describe it definitely as "masculine" or "feminine".

Unfortunately, such a clear-cut demarcation is not possible. The psychoanalysts, with their improved techniques for studying the bases and manifestations of human behavior, were the first to give a logical presentation of the concept that both masculine and feminine traits are incorporated in every individual. Freud discusses this matter in the following terms:

> It is necessary to make clear that the conceptions, "masculine" and "feminine", whose content seems so unequivocal to the ordinary meaning, belong to the most confused terms in science . . . In man . . . there is no pure masculinity or femininity either in the biological or psychological sense. On the contrary, every individual person shows a mixture of his own biological sex characteristics with the biological traits of the other sex and a union of activity and passivity; this is the case whether these psychological characteristic features depend on biological elements or whether they are independent of them.[1]

From this, it is apparent that the question of masculinity and femininity is much more complex than it is generally considered to be, and that there is a mixture of apparently antithetical traits in each individual.

Since Freud's first observations on this matter, the problem of female sexuality and the blending of both masculine and feminine traits in each individual has offered a fertile ground for discussion by the psychoanalysts. Masculinity and femininity have been traditionally defined in terms of aggres-

---

1 Sigmund Freud, The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud (New York: The Modern Library, 1938), p. 612, footnote.

sion and submissiveness, or activity and passivity,[2] but it is necessary that these terms be very accurately defined. It appears that none of these traits is peculiar to either sex, but may appear in different ways in both sexes. Quoting Imre Hermann, Markey and Noble have pointed out that:

> Aggression is a tendency peculiar to both sexes, not just to males. It merely shows itself differently. Woman actively resists or seduces and her coquettish behavior is by no means passive.[3] [Italics in the original.]

Again, Margaret Brierly has stated that:

> Masculinity in women is by no means entirely regressive. There is a primary masculinity which has to be, not suppressed, but co-ordinated with feminine impulses, but which may very easily become exaggerated as a means of defence against femininity.[4]

It is evident from a cursory study of psychoanalytic literature that the problem of establishing acceptable norms of masculinity and femininity has still to be resolved. It can be concluded, however, that no individual is wholly masculine or feminine in either biological make-up or psychologically-determined behavior, but is a complex combination of both masculine and feminine components. It follows that any decision as to the "masculinity" or femininity" of an individual

---

2 Ibid., p. 612, footnote, and W. G. Sumner, Folkways (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940), pp. 343-344.

3 O. B. Markey and Helen Noble, "An Evaluation of the Masculinity Factor in Boarding Home Situations", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 6:260, April, 1936.

4 Margaret Brierly, "Some Problems of Integration in Women", The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 13:435, October, 1932.

must be made on the basis of the relative balance in the individual between the traits accepted as masculine and feminine. In other words, if a man's masculine traits seem to be dominant and his feminine traits adequately sublimated, he would be judged masculine. If his masculine traits seemed to be subservient to traits accepted as feminine, he would be considered effeminate. That the latter is more often true than is generally believed was shown by Markey and Noble, who studied boarding homes in an attempt to determine which parent assumed the masculine role in the families. As a result of their investigation:

> . . . the authors were impressed with written and clinical evidence of the suggestion that masculinity was not necessarily incorporated in the adult males and that femininity, conversely, was not dominantly characteristic of the adult females in the boarding homes studied.[5]

If it is true that adults of each sex exhibit characteristics of the opposite sex, then it is even more true that children may be confused in their adjustments to their roles as male and female. Their behavior patterns are not yet fixed, and they are more likely than adults to display a scattered pattern of traits that include both those obviously masculine and obviously feminine. Normal psychosexual development is precarious at best, and it may be interrupted by any number of crippling forces. For example:

---

5 Markey and Noble, op. cit., p. 260.

> In many cases homosexuality is the result of interference with the ordinary course of psychosexual development, by which the homosexual component in the bisexual structure of every human being becomes dominant at the expense of the heterosexual. This interference may be due to 1, a rejection by the normal heterosexual object (the parent of the opposite sex), 2, excessive physical and psychic stimulation by the normal homosexual object (the parent of the same sex), or to 3, a series of marked homosexual seductions by older children or adults . . .[6]

To further complicate the problem, "typical" masculine and feminine behavior is conditioned not only by biological considerations but also by the mores of the society in which one lives. Margaret Mead and other anthropologists have pointed out that behavior perfectly acceptable as "masculine" in one cultural group may be considered "feminine" in another group, and vice versa. In discussing two primitive New Guinea societies, Margaret Mead has said:

> . . . whereas the Arapesh have standardized the personality of both men and women in a mould that . . . we should describe as maternal, womanly, unmasculine, the Mundugumor have gone to the opposite extreme and have standardized the behavior of both men and women as actively masculine, virile, and without any of the softening and mellowing characteristics that we are accustomed to believe are inalienable womanly . . .[7]

In reference to our own society:

> Karen Horney . . . believes it is necessary to be free of the "masculine mode of thought" so characteristic of this man-controlled society if femininity is to be understood . . . "our whole civilization"

---

6 O. S. English and G. H. Pearson, Common Neuroses of Children and Adults (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1937), p. 174.

7 Margaret Mead, Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies (New York: W. W. Morrow and Company, 1935), p. 165.

> is masculine, man-created, and . . . a just estimate of what constitutes male and female natures cannot therefore be made. Inadequate achievement by a person of either sex is contemptuously referred to as "feminine"! 8

These observations are undoubtedly true, and they emphasize the importance of societal mores in defining "masculine" and "feminine" behavior. Since the author is considering "masculinity" and "femininity" of children in our culture, he must be guided by criteria acceptable to the society in which we live.

The above discussion of psychoanalytic thought has emphasized two points: first, that both masculine and feminine traits are present in both sexes and, secondly, that any conclusion as to the masculinity or femininity of an individual must be based on the relative strength and proportion of these traits in the individual. The brief discussion was necessary to bring out these two factors, but it is not the author's intention to make his decisions, on the cases studied, according to psychoanalytical and psychiatric concepts. Rather, the intent of this study is to determine whether boys and girls of two-child families exhibit predominantly feminine or masculine reactions in the social situation. The author has given more consideration to the picture of a child's personality and behavior as given by parents, school teachers, relatives, and

---

8 Markey and Noble, op. cit., p. 265.

social workers, than to the basic patterns that emerged in psychiatric interviews or analysis.

In using the child's reactions to the social situation as the basis for judgment, it was necessary to establish criteria which accorded with general societal standards of masculinity and femininity, just as the concept of the "normal" in social case work is:

> . . . a composite of generally recognized and accepted, desirable standards of living and behavior, which society upholds and which have been laid down in mores and laws.[9]

Markey and Noble, in the study referred to above, asked five people to make lists of masculine and feminine traits. The authors concluded that:

> The inventory of feminine and masculine traits offered by these five observers confirms the general impression that masculinity equates activity and aggression and that femininity equates submissiveness, passivity, and dependency.[10]

The authors used this as their definition in studying the boarding-homes. Bearing in mind that each individual includes all these traits in his makeup, and that the important factor is the relative balance among them, the author has accepted the above definition as his general criterion for studying masculinity and femininity in children.

In studying the case records the author abstracted all

---

9 Leroy M. A. Maeder, "Diagnostic Criteria - the Concept of Normal and Abnormal," The Family, 22:172, October, 1941.

10 Markey and Noble, op. cit., p. 261.

material descriptive of the child's personality in general, his relation to his parents, sibling, and other children, his health, interests, expressed ambitions and school adjustment. From the total picture of the child's reaction patterns as indicated by this material, the decision was made by the author as to whether the child showed predominantly feminine or predominantly masculine traits. If the material was not sufficient to give a clear-cut picture, or if the masculine and feminine traits seemed to be equally balanced, the case was labelled as "doubtful".

The illustrative cases summarized in the following chapter will further clarify the criteria used in judging masculinity and femininity.

CHAPTER III

Illustrative Cases

The present chapter contains a brief summary of six cases and a discussion of the major factors considered in deciding as to "masculinity" and "femininity" in each case. The cases include three boys, illustrating the categories of "effeminate", "doubtful", and "masculine", and three girls, representing the "masculine", "doubtful", and "feminine" groups. No brothers and sisters are included among the six cases, as the author felt that the examples would be less confusing if the emphasis were placed on only one child in each social situation.

It is not the author's intention to discuss the possible causations for the various problems presented by these children. Rather, the purpose is to outline the family situation and to point out the factors which influenced the author in his decisions as to "masculinity" and "femininity". A discussion of the dynamic factors interwoven in every problem situation would involve considerations far beyond the limits of this study.

Case One

Billy Leonard was twelve years and seven months old when his mother, at the suggestion of a doctor, referred him to the

Judge Baker Guidance Center because of "laziness, lack of initiative, apathetic attitude and lack of competitive sense". The sister, Sarah, eight years old, was not referred, although Mrs. Leonard later spoke of Sarah as "a behavior problem". The family is Jewish. Billy was in the ninth grade, and his Intelligence Quotient was 115 on the Stanford-Binet Test. His grades in school were very good and the teachers reported that he had never been a behavior problem. The health of both children had always been excellent.

Mr. Leonard was described by his wife as a slow, stolid man who never did anything without carefully considering every alternative. He was out of the home most of the time and apparently did not play a very large part in raising the children. According to the mother, Mr. Leonard was very fond of his son, but was annoyed by Billy's deference toward him, and thought that Billy should argue and "stand up" to him. Mrs. Leonard was a keen, intelligent, confident and self-assured woman with a very decisive and business-like manner. She had worked before her marriage, and in one year advanced from the position of stenographer to that of private secretary. She said that she had a "drive to get ahead" and that it was impossible for her to cry or to show emotion in any way. Both parents put great emphasis on school acheivement, and Billy entered school at the age of four. Apparently both parents had always given Billy everything he wanted, and Mrs. Leonard admitted that he

was probably spoiled. At Mr. Leonard's insistence Billy was bottle-fed until he was three and one-half years old.

Mrs. Leonard described Billy as a good, obedient boy, respectful of authority, who never argued and never fought back. He always accepted punishment without overt protest. His usual reaction to discipline and frustration was to "close up and sulk". He had a "high ethical sense" and could always be relied on to tell the truth. "He had absolutely no sense of competition, . . . no push, no urge to do things for himself." As the mother put it, "He just hasn't any 'umph'!" Unlike Sarah, Billy had no apparent desire to excell in anything. He seemed to be "emotionally flat", with little apparent reaction to any situation. However, shortly before referral, Mr. Leonard refused to buy Billy a watch which he wanted, and Billy had an hysterical attack, in which he cried, screamed, and had convulsions.

The mother said that Billy had never been very affectionate, although he was somewhat more so after Sarah's birth. He was very fond of his mother and came to her to talk over his problems. When Mrs. Leonard was ill with pneumonia, Billy refused to leave the house, but cared for her constantly until she was fully recovered. Billy was respectful toward Mr. Leonard, but apparently the relationship between them was not very close. Billy and Sarah quarreled continually, mostly as a result of Sarah's teasing of Billy.

The psychologist who tested Billy described him as a sturdy boy with small, babyish features and an alert, vivacious expression. In the testing period he was over-confident but defensive, arguing incessantly if his replies were questioned. When Billy did not know the answers he tried to bluff. The psychologist thought that he was somewhat spoiled; "a curious mixture of maturity and immaturity." After his first interview with Billy, the psychiatrist reported that he was an "alert, lively, engaging boy" who seemed to exhibit "very normal personality characteristics".

Billy's interests were not very widespread. Except that he liked to wrestle, he was not interested in athletics. Mrs. Leonard said that this was due to the fact that he was afraid of being injured, and Billy said that he disliked football because it was too dangerous. He expressed a desire for a BB gun and a bicycle, but did not learn to ride the latter. Billy was very fond of reading and read a great deal. He was interested in a marionette group at school, and was enthusiastic about classical music, spending considerable time listening to operas and symphonies on the radio. He had made several attempts to compose serious music. When questioned about his ambitions, Billy at first said that he wanted to be a scientist, and later said that he intended to specialize in chemistry.

In reference to Billy's relationships with other children, Mrs. Leonard's description was rather contradictory. She

said that Billy was "anti-social", and his few friends were mostly older boys who dominated him. At the same time, the mother said that Billy was very anxious to be ordinary, to be like the other boys, but that he would never admit himself at fault in anything, would never compromise with his friends, and always insisted on having his own way. Billy was beginning to imitate the rough language used by the other boys. He was "very naive" and had not displayed any curiosity about sex. Although Billy liked "kissing games", the mother thought that he had not yet developed much interest in girls.

In considering this situation it will be well to note the personalities of the parents and their relationships with the children. It is apparent that Mrs. Leonard was the more aggressive of the two and that she was the dominating figure in the home. Apparently Mr. Leonard's chief function in regard to Billy was that of occasional punishment and reinforcing the mother's determination that Billy should achieve well in school. It is suggestive of Mrs. Leonard's attitude toward Billy that she did not say anything in describing him that did not imply criticism. She identified Billy very directly with his father, saying that they were just alike in every way. In referring to Sarah, Mrs. Leonard said that she was just like herself, and apparently took considerable pride in relating that Sarah was mischievous and rebellious at times.

Despite the psychiatrist's original observation that

Billy seemed to have "very normal personality characteristics", the sum of his reaction patterns, interests, ambitions and relationships with others seems to present a rather remarkable picture of passivity and submission, rather than the activity and aggression which the author has accepted as "normal" for boys in the society in which we live. Billy's usual reaction to frustration and punishment was a passive withdrawal - pouting and sulking. On the one reported occasion when he reacted overtly to frustration, he had an "hysterical attack", which could hardly be considered an active, aggressive reaction.

Billy seems to have been "too good" - too obedient, too respectful, too amenable to all pressures. The very lack of any report of misbehavior at school or in the neighborhood would seem to indicate a lack of "normally" aggressive boyish activity. Billy's expressed ambition to be a chemist perhaps indicates a desire for a sheltered, withdrawn existence. With the exception of wrestling, Billy had none of the usual boyish interest in athletics and active games, and his esthetic interests must have labelled him a "sissy" among the other boys. The passivity indicated in the mother's description of Billy as lacking in drive, initiative, and competitive sense was well substantiated.

Bearing in mind that all persons include both masculine and feminine components in their make-up, it was to be expected that Billy would exhibit some behavior not in accord with the general picture. His interest in wrestling would certainly be

considered "normal", and he seemed to be somewhat aggressive toward other boys and toward Sarah, although the information on this matter was incomplete. His behavior during the psychological tests was rather belligerent.

From the total picture of Billy's personality an his adjustment to the social situation, the author concluded, in accordance with the definition given in the previous chapter, that Billy was definitely "effeminate".

Case Two

At the suggestion of the mother of a former client, John Leary was referred by his mother because of truancy from school, running away from home, and impudence to Mrs. Leary. John was fourteen years and five months old at the time of referral. He was in the eighth grade at school, and his Intelligence Quotient on the Stanford-Binet Test was ninety-six. His sibling, Margaret, was eleven years of age, and was not referred to the clinic.

As Mrs. Leary's health was poor, she was seen only once by the social worker, and a complete picture of the part she played in the family situation was not obtained. She was thought to be fairly intelligent and competent, but was inclined to over-exaggerate the seriousness of John's problems and to be "worried sick" about him. She was quite defensive of John, blaming the school for most of his difficulties. She

thought that Mr. Leary was too harsh with John, and protected him as much as possible from the father's punishment. Apparently Mrs. Leary was quite restrictive of John, keeping him at home much of the time and forbidding him to play with "undesirable"boys.

Mr. Leary, who was seen several times at the clinic, was described as a very likeable, nervously energetic man who said that he "loved to work" and seemed to have a "tremendous need" to do so. He was a travelling salesman and was out of the home a considerable part of the time because of his work. Mr. Leary seemed very fond of John and often did things with him, but was "terribly aggravated" by John's behavior, especially his impudence to Mrs. Leary. Mr. Leary whipped John severely and often threatened to whip him without doing so.

John had a very difficult health history, including several accidents and operations. At the age of seven he was kicked in the abdomen and developed a rupture which necessitated an operation. On two different occasions he was struck by automobiles and sustained a fractured skull, two broken arms and two broken wrists. Mr. Leary thought that John "had not been the same" since the second of these accidents.

In reference to John's personality, Mrs. Leary said that he was "a regular Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde". He was either very good or very bad, sometimes impudent, at other times gentle and cooperative. The school principal reported

that John was not dependable or trustworthy, because he was either courteous and agreeable or very offensive. According to the mother, John was quite selfish and egotistical, constantly boasting about his athletic prowess or how he would some day be very famous. Mrs. Leary reported that he had a good sense of humor and was fond of practical jokes. She said that John "blew up" when he was frustrated in any way and that he was indifferent to whippings, but Mr. Leary said that John was penitent after being punished for misbehavior. At times John reacted to punishment by going to his room and refusing to come out to talk with anyone for several hours.

John maintained that the school authorities discriminated against him, and he was impudent to the truant officer. Mr. Leary reported that for days at a time John seldom left the home, but helped his mother by sewing, cooking, ironing, scrubbing floors and washing dishes. During these periods John was very affectionate toward his mother, but at other times he was offensive toward her. Mrs. Leary thought that John returned after running away because he feared that she would worry about him. John was quite ambivalent toward his father, apparently fearful of being whipped by Mr. Leary, but also resenting his father's absences from the home because he felt that Mr. Leary could not spend as much time with him as he desired.

It was apparent that John was jealous of Margaret and was very aggressive toward her, ordering her about, teasing,

criticizing and occasionally striking her. John had only a few friends, partly because he antagonized other children by his over-bearing manner, and partly due to the fact that Mrs. Leary limited his contacts to boys of whom she approved. John accepted this limitation without protest. It was reported that John was very aggressive toward other boys, and seemed to enjoy the occasional fights that resulted from this attitude.

John was not interested in reading but was very fond of sports, including fishing, swimming, baseball and football. He said that his chief pleasure was watching professional baseball games. At various times John expressed a desire to be an aviator, a major league baseball player, a boxer, and a sailor. His interest in housework has been referred to above.

The psychologist noted that John was quite mature-looking but ambivalent in his reactions to the tests - he was responsive to attention and encouragement, but was defensive about his work and boasted of his intelligence. During his interviews with the psychiatrist John was quite aggressive and attempted to take charge of the discussions. The psychiatrist noted the possibility of "traumatic encephalopathy" in reference to John's early injuries.

Considering the picture of John's reactions in the social situation, he seems to exhibit a mixture of both masculine and feminine traits. His athletic interests were the u-

sual ones for boys of his age, and his expressed ambitions were certainly of a masculine, aggressive nature. Although John did not adjust well to other boys, this was apparently due more to an over-aggressive attitude than to a passive one. His aggressive behavior toward his sister and others, his impudence to his mother and his egocentric boasting were active reactions to situations. On the other hand, John seemed to be very passive in many ways. He accepted without overt protest his mother's stipulations as to the boys he could associate with. He took pleasure in doing various household tasks for his mother that are definitely considered to be "women's work". It is significant that John was not reported to be a behavior problem either at home or at school. John was referred for study chiefly because of his truanting from school and running away from home, which may be considered as passive, rather than active, reactions to unpleasant situations. The same principle of passive reaction applies to John's practice of "sulking" in his room after being punished.

It seemed to the author that there was a fairly even balance between the feminine traits and the masculine traits as summarized above, and this case was categorized as "doubtful".

Case Three

Joseph Thomas was eight years and seven months old when

his father referred him, at the suggestion of the school principal, because of poor school work, truancy, petty stealing and occasional destructive behavior. Joe was in the third grade, and had an Intelligence Quotient of 117 on the Stanford-Binet Test. His sister, Helen, seven years and two months old, was not referred to the clinic.

Mrs. Thomas was a small, plump, attractive young woman who was very shy and frightened at first, but gradually became more assured. It was very apparent from the material that Mrs. Thomas was still quite dependent upon her own mother, and deferred to her opinions on most subjects. The mother was more amused than concerned about Joe's problems, but used the clinic as a threat, telling Joe that he was coming to the clinic to be "put away". Mrs. Thomas had been "desperately disappointed" when Joe was born, as she had hoped the baby would be a girl. She took little part in disciplining Joe because she "practically had hysteria" every time she had to punish him.

The father was described as a tall, well-built, gray-haired man, ten years older than his wife. He talked clearly and easily in a frank, intelligent and strait-forward manner, and the social worker commented that he made a very good impression. Mr. Thomas was very protective of his wife, saying that she was nervous and easily upset and not really strong enough to handle a boy like Joe. According to Mrs. Thomas,

the father did not like children and "should never have been a father". He became enraged at Joe for small misdemeanors, and often beat him severely. Both parents were determined to send Joe away to a boarding school.

The parents described Joe as a talkative, good-natured, outgoing boy who made friends easily among both children and adults. He did not take anything very seriously, and was not upset by punishment or threats. During the truanting episodes Joe roamed around the streets, looked into the shop windows and played on the playgrounds. The father said that he was so active it was difficult to keep him in sight; he would disappear in a moment if not watched. Mrs. Thomas reported that Joe had occasional outbursts of temper when he was quite destructive. At one time he pulled the slats off a Venetian blind, and another time he ripped a mattress apart. Ordinarily, however, he was very good-natured and pleasant around the home. The only stealing Joe had done was in company with several other boys who had stolen small articles from a five-and-ten-cent store. Joe's teacher reported that he was normally mischievous at school, but not a real behavior problem. His school work was fairly good, although not commensurate with his ability as indicated by the intelligence tests.

Joe seemed to have a fairly wide range of interests. He liked to read, especially adventure and animal stories, and "comics" such as Dick Tracy and Superman. His favorite radio

programs were The Lone Ranger and Tom Mix. According to Mr. Thomas, Joe was very good in sports, particularly swimming, baseball, football and skating. He was a member of a handicraft group at a settlement house, and attended regularly. Mr. Thomas was concerned about Joe's fondness for playing with other children on the streets. Joe stated that he would like to be either an engineer or an aviator.

In reference to Joe's relationships with other children, the parents reported that he made friends easily and had several close friends whom he had first known in kindergarten. Joe had occasional fights in which he held his own. The teacher said that he did his part in all class activities and was well accepted by the other children. Joe was apparently fond of Helen and took some responsibility for her care, although there was occasional teasing and quarreling between them.

The psychologist described Joe as an "alert, lively, attractive youngster" who was friendly and very well poised during the testing period. Although somewhat guarded in his responses, he was cooperative and attacked the tests with considerable assurance. She noted that he was spontaneous and "seemed quite manly for his age". The psychiatrist observed after the first interview that Joe seemed to be a "normally active youngster, evidently quite aggressive and quite manly". Later, Joe expressed considerable hostility against both

parents.

On the whole, Joe seemed to present a fairly good picture of a "normal" boy. He was apparently gregarious and got along well with others, and his interests and activities were those that are expected of a boy of his age. His aggression toward his sister and other children was well within the acceptable bounds. Most of his hostility toward the parents was expressed in an active, aggressive manner, with the exception of truanting and staying away from home.

The author concluded that Joe should be classified as "masculine".

Case Four

June Manwell was eleven years and six months when she was referred by her mother at the suggestion of a friend, because of "show-off behavior, and over-bearing manner; poor relationships with other children, and enuresis". June was in the sixth grade at the time of referral, and her Intelligence Quotient on the Stanford-Binet Test was 103. June's younger brother, George, nine years and seven months of age, was later referred because of poor school work and asthmatic attacks, apparently with an emotional basis. June's health had always been good.

Mrs. Manwell, a former school teacher, was a "large,

domineering woman" who talked constantly and felt that she had an excellent understanding of child psychology. She was the leader of a 4-H club, and held offices in various religious and social groups. She talked a great deal about her relatives and neighbors, and never mentioned anyone, with the exception of Mr. Manwell, without criticism. Mrs. Manwell was one of five sisters and had always wanted a brother. She obviously wanted her first child to be a boy, and was extremely disappointed when June was born. Mrs. Manwell attempted to give an objective picture of June and her problems, but it was apparent that she had considerable feeling about June's exclusion by the children of the mother's friends, for example. At the case conference it was observed that Mrs. Manwell "obviously had a warmer feeling for George" than for June.

Mrs. Manwell was not seen at the clinic, and Mrs. Manwell seldom referred to him. The social worker observed that "although the mother is the more dominant person of the two, the father sometimes takes a stand which, apparently, the mother respects." Mr. Manwell was fairly active in church, school and community affairs.

Mrs. Manwell described June as "full of mischief, energy and determination". Other children referred to her as "fresh", and adults said that she was over-bearing. She had a bad temper and was "extremely domineering" with other children. She sometimes adjusted fairly well in a small group,

but in a larger group, where she did not receive very much attention, she inevitably was unruly. June argued incessantly with anyone who disagreed with her or tried to correct her about anything. The mother felt that June was stubborn and could not be led, but could sometimes be persuaded to do things that she disliked. She had little regard for the feelings of others, and often acted "just plain mean". June embarrassed her mother on the street by being "uppish and loud". She was reported to be a disturbing influence in the classroom, church choir, and Girl Scout meetings. Shortly after referral, June, at the urging of a friend, stole a piece of jewelry from a five-and-ten-cent store. She was very penitent about this and seemed to be relieved that Mrs. Manwell made her pay for the jewelry. The mother said that June took considerable pride in her appearance. She was "super-sensitive" and often asked why people did not like her.

June was two years old when George was born, and she exhibited considerable jealousy toward him. Although the mother was sure that these incidents were accidental, June stepped on George, poked her finger in his eye, upset his baby carriage, and took his bottle away before he had finished eating. At the time of referral, June reproached her mother for paying more attention to George than to herself. June was scornful of George's unwillingness to fight, and urged him to "sock the boys" when they teased him. She liked to wrestle

with George, but he avoided this as much as possible. The mother observed that, of the two children, June was better able to fight her own battles, and said that George's life was not made any happier by "having such a dominating sister".

As indicated above, June's relationships with other children were very poor. She had one girl friend who was "easy-going" and did not attempt to "boss" June. When another girl was chosen as Scribe in the Girl Scout troop, a position which June wanted very much, she took out her resentment on the girl who was chosen, and for a time virtually assumed command of the troop. A girl member of the mother's 4-H club came to the home and asked to listen to June's radio. June put her forcibly out of the house and told her to go to her own home. According to Mrs. Manwell, June was "somewhat interested" in boys, although she had no particular friends among them. She was not "annoyed" by boys, and sometimes played active games with them. June had not yet begun to mature, but her mother had given her a considerable amount of sex information, much of it too adult for June to understand.

Besides belonging to the Scout troop and the 4-H club, June was very fond of music and was a member of the church choir. She did not care for regular housework, but did "lovely art work", weaving, and sewing. She earned a prize in a 4-H club contest for a dress which she had made.

The psychologist described June as a handsome child,

well-poised and polite. She worked steadily but without any enthusiasm, and did not become restless nor fatigued. During the testing period she was reserved and gave no indication of aggressive behavior. The psychiatrist observed that June was an "exuberant" child, with a very vigorous way of talking and acting. She described June as a "small edition of her mother". At the case conference it was observed that June seemed to have constantly before her a pattern of dominance from her parents, and she perhaps had to have some chance to dominate also.

Again, the personalities of the parents are interesting in reference to the child and her problems. It was evident that Mrs. Manwell was the more dominant of the two parents, at least in the family situation. It is interesting that June exhibited personality characteristics similar to those of the mother, and that Mrs. Manwell was concerned over this, but was not particularly disturbed by George's rather passive behavior. It is by no means certain that June was really rejected by her mother, but certainly Mrs. Manwell preferred George to her.

Because of June's thoroughly "feminine" interests, she was not the type of girl who would be labelled a "tom-boy", but apparently her personality patterns as a whole were of a very actively aggressive nature. Her reactions to various situations - to Mrs. Manwell's dominance, restrictions and

frustrations of various kinds, and the arrival and presence of her brother - contained very few elements of submissiveness, "which accomplishes results by indirection and by an apparent yielding to outside forces and rather shapes them from within".[1]

Every source seemed to confirm the picture of June as an extremely capable, energetic, dominant and aggressive girl. In the social situation she carried to extremes the types of behavior which are socially accepted if exhibited by boys.

The author considered June to be "masculine".

Case Five

Alice Hartman was fifteen years and three months old when she was referred by Mrs. Hartman, at the suggestion of the mother of a former client, because of lying, petty stealing, and aggressive behavior at school. The family was Jewish. Alice was in the ninth grade and received an Intelligence Quotient of 87 on the Stanford-Binet Test. Her brother, Arthur, eleven years of age, was not referred to the clinic. Alice's health was excellent, except that she was considerably overweight.

Mrs. Hartman seemed to be rather intelligent, but she had little understanding of Alice and her problems. She was quite nervous and anxious and it was apparent that her hand-

---

1 William A. White, The Mental Hygiene of Childhood (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1923), p. 86.

ling of the children was very inconsistent, alternately lenient and strict. She was unable to accept any suggestions for altering her treatment of the children. The social worker sensed an "underlying restriction and aggressiveness" in her attitude toward Alice. It was apparent that Arthur was the mother's favorite.

Mr. Hartman was more straitforward and less nervous than the mother, but he was very strict with Alice and supervised her very closely. The father seemed very peculiar in some ways, and apparently was rather unstable. He left the home periodically, generally when the family was under financial stress. He never provided adequately for the family, and the maternal relatives gave considerable assistance. There was a good deal of tension between the parents, especially in reference to the children. The mother seemed to fear that Mr. Hartman would win Alice's affection away from her.

Alice admired her mother, and seemed to be very affectionate toward her. She was also very much attached to Mr. Hartman, although she resented his over-strict supervision and felt that he did not understand her. There was no apparent conflict between the two children.

Mrs. Hartman described Alice as being generally quite agreeable and amenable about the home, but occasionally she had an outburst of temper when her mother told her to do something, and she would "yell back and start a quarrel". Some-

times when reprimanded she would be sullen, and would withdraw for a considerable period of time. The mother stated that she was ashamed of Alice's behavior when in the company of others, because she was inclined to talk very loud and her actions and speech were somewhat coarse. Alice was inconsiderate of her mother's feelings and took very little responsibility about the home. She was very careless and inefficient in regard to housework, and the mother described her as "lazy". Alice had stolen small amounts of money at home on various occasions, and spent this money buying presents for her friends. The school principal reported that Alice was sometimes unmanageable, and she was inclined to cheat and lie when she was questioned about any misdemeanor. According to the mother, Alice was very much like Mr. Hartman, and he was the only one who could really "handle her".

Alice had a number of girl friends, of whom the parents approved, and they reported that several "nice" boys had come to the home to see her. She often associated with boys much older than herself and had had several dates. The teacher thought that Alice was "overly interested" in boys. At one time Mr. Hartman suspected that Alice had had sexual experience with boys and questioned her until she finally admitted it. Later Alice denied this, and the accusation was not definitely proven. Alice was quite athletic, often playing rough games with boys and holding her own with them. She belonged

to the Junior Hadassah and to a mixed club, and apparently made a satisfactory adjustment in these. Alice was also a member of a Girl Scout troop and liked it very much. Alice wanted to be either a social worker or a children's nurse.

The psychologist described Alice as a "very stout, matronly, coarse-looking girl" who was "overly-mature-looking in build and manner."

The picture of Alice, as summarized above, is not very complete, but it seems to indicate a combination of "masculine" and "feminine" traits. At school and, at times, at home, she was quite aggressive and belligerent, reacting actively to frustration and pressure. Lying and stealing are socially considered to be aggressive, "unfeminine" behavior. Alice's ability in rough games with boys and the mother's description of her behavior in a group do not indicate that she was of a "sweetly feminine" nature. However, the opposite side of the picture is equally as strong. At times Alice reacted to criticism in a passive manner, becoming sullen and withdrawn. She apparently adjusted normally to girls' and mixed groups, and her ambitions and most of her interests were thoroughly feminine. The information concerning the nature of her social adjustments to boys was too incomplete to warrant a decision.

The author included Alice in the"doubtful" group.

Case Six

Ella Jansen was fifteen years and six months old when her step-mother referred her to the clinic because of shyness and "odd behavior". The family was Swedish-American. Ella was in the tenth grade at the time of referral, and she had an Intelligence Quotient of 91 on the Stanford-Binet test. She had been given a group Intelligence Test at school, and her mark there was 107. Her brother, Henry, was seventeen years of age, and was not referred to the clinic. The step-mother reported that Ella had always had "perfect health", with no serious illnesses and few minor sicknesses.

Ella's mother had become ill when Ella was small, and died when her daughter was six years old. Mr. Jansen remarried eleven months later. The step-mother was an attractive, intelligent woman, and, obviously, was very fond of both the children. The social worker reported that she had "done an excellent job in training them". She seemed to carry much of the responsibility of the home, and handled Ella with understanding.

Mr. Jansen was described as a tense, nervous man, who was rather serious in nature. He was evidently worried by Ella's difficulty with her school work. He had great respect for academic learning. Apparently, he had little time to spend with his children.

Ella had been fond of her own mother, but seemed to be very much attached to her step-mother. She was able to discuss her difficulties with her step-mother, and apparently relied on her to a considerable extent. Ella spoke affectionately of her father, but seemed somewhat in awe of him. Apparently there were few conflicts between the children, although Ella occasionally teased her brother.

Mrs. Jansen said that Ella was a "fine girl in many ways", but that she was often worried by Ella's strange behavior. She stated that Ella would talk little with anyone, and seemed afraid of people. Ella didn't like to go to the store because of her fears. She often retired to her room, especially when she had been reprimanded. Ella insisted on barricading the closet door, because of her terror that "something might be in there".

Ella had a normal number of girl friends, and seemed to adjust well to small groups. She liked boys, and had had two dates. The step-mother reported that when Ella first menstruated she was uninformed on sex subjects, and was extremely frightened.

The teacher said that Ella's main difficulty in school was that she was so shy she could not recite before the class. She had had fair marks up to a year before her referral, but lately had not been doing as well.

Ella's ambition was to be a nurse. She still kept a

doll and doll carriage in her room, and when it was suggested that she put them away, she replied that she "was not through with them yet". She enjoyed sewing and embroidering, but disliked housework in general. She was "easy to discipline", and cried bitterly when punished.

The psychologist reported that she was "pretty, sweet and feminine-looking", and that she "did not seem self-conscious".

The entire picture of Ella's personality, interests, and behavior seems to present a clear indication of her "femininity". She had, indeed, gone to an extreme in this direction, and was too passive, too unaggressive. She was evidently very dependent on her step-mother. It is interesting that she seemed well-adjusted to small groups of children, although afraid of indefinite "things", and very shy of other people.

The author decided that Ella was definitely in the "feminine" group.

The above case summaries, together with the discussion of each case, have indicated the factors taken into consideration by the author in determining the grouping of all the children studied. The case history of each child in the study group was analysed according to these same criteria. The case summaries also indicated the factors considered in determin-

ing the relative influence of the parents in the home.

The following chapter gives a picture of the study group as a whole, including ages of the children, reasons for referral, family constellation, et cetera.

CHAPTER IV

The Study Group

The entire group considered in this study consisted of one hundred children, fifty boys and fifty girls, representing fifty family units. Of this group, fifty-nine children were studied at the clinic; in eight cases only the girls were studied; and in nine cases both the boy and the girl were studied. Of these nine, the boy was referred before the girl in six instances. Thus, a total of forty-two boys and seventeen girls were studied at the clinic, or, roughly, a proportion of seven boys to three girls. That this proportion is similar to that of the general clinic population is indicated by the report of Healy and Bronner, who studied four hundred cases accepted by the clinic between the early months of 1931 and January, 1934. Of these four hundred cases, seventy per cent were boys and thirty per cent were girls.[1]

The ages of the children referred to the clinic and of those in the study group as a whole are shown in Table I. For the fifty boys who made up the study group, the age range was six to eighteen years, and the median age was slightly over twelve years. For the fifty girls, the age range was also six

---

1 William Healy and Augusta F. Bronner, Treatment and What Happened Afterward (Boston: Judge Baker Guidance Center, 1939), p. 22.

TABLE I

Ages of the Children

Ages	The Study Group		Group Referred to the Clinic	
	Number of Boys	Number of Girls	Number of Boys	Number of Girls
6	2	8	1	1
7	3	2	1	
8	4	5	4	3
9	3	4	3	2
10	8	5	8	1
11	4	4	3	2
12	7	3	7	1
13	5	5	4	
14	4	2	3	2
15	3	3	3	2
16	1	3	1	1
17	4	4	3	1
18	2	2	1	1
Total	50	50	42	17

to eighteen years, and the median age was slightly over eleven years, or one year less than that of the boys. For the forty-two boys and seventeen girls referred to the clinic, the age ranges were the same and the median ages were very nearly the same as for the entire group. In the fifty sibling couples, twenty-nine of the boys were the older, twenty of the girls were the older, and there was one set of twins.

Of the forty-two boys studied at the clinic, thirty-eight were given the Stanford-Binet Test, and four were given the Army Alpha Test. The Intelligence Quotient range was from seventy to 145, with sixteen below one hundred, and twenty-two above one hundred. The median Intelligence Quotient was 107.5. The average Army Alpha score for the four boys was 153, or approximately ninety-five per cent for the general population. Sixteen girls were given the Stanford-Binet Test and one was given the Army Alpha Test. The Intelligence Quotient range was from seventy-seven to 130, with three below one hundred and thirteen above one hundred. The median Intelligence Quotient was 107.5, or exactly the same as for the boys. The single Army Alpha score was 143, or ninety-four per cent for the general population. It is apparent that both groups scored as having high average general intelligence, but the figures do not warrant any speculation as to the intelligence of children in other families of this configuration, as the clinic seldom accepts feeble-minded children for study, and the number of

children considered here is very small.[2]

In forty-one of the fifty families, the real parents were living together with the children. In seven cases either the father was dead or the parents were divorced, and the children had lived with the mother for periods of from four to ten years in length. In one case, the mother had been dead for two years and the children had lived with the father. In the fiftieth case, the children had lived with their father and stepmother for eight of the nine years since the mother's death.

The problems for which the children were referred to the clinic are given in Table II. Whenever possible, similar problems were grouped together under one heading for the sake of brevity and ease in handling. For example, the heading of "fearfulness" includes fear of the dark, fear of being alone in the daytime, and fear of animals.

It should be noted that the problems listed here were those that were indicated by the referring persons at the time of referral, and do not necessarily include all the difficulties that the children exhibited. In fact, the problems listed do not include many that were found to be of primary importance in individual cases. It is probable that the difficulties as stated at the time of referral indicate those with the most meaning to the referring parent, rather than those

---

2 Ibid., p. 22.

TABLE II

The Referral Problems

Problem	Number of Boys	Number of Girls
Aggressive Behavior		
Mischief in School or Home	3	1
Destructiveness	1	0
Stealing	7	2
Petty Stealing	4	0
Breaking and Entering	1	0
	16	3
Aggressive Personality Characteristics		
Show-off Attitude	0	1
Overbearing Attitude	2	2
Defiance	4	1
	6	4
Passive Behavior		
Obstinacy	3	1
Lying	1	2
Truancy	6	0
Running Away	4	1
Staying Out Late	2	1
	16	5
Passive Personality Characteristics		
Irresponsibility	3	0
Sensitiveness	1	0
Fearfulness	4	1
Nervousness	2	1
Shyness	1	0
Procrastination	1	0
Indifference or Listlessness	6	0
Laziness	2	0
Lack of Concentration	4	1
Lack of Initiative	2	0
Dawdling	1	0
	27	3
Sub-total	65	15

(Continued on next page)

TABLE II (Continued)

The Referral Problems

Problem	Number of Boys	Number of Girls
Sub-total	65	15
School Adjustment		
Poor School Work	19	0
	19	0
Adjustments to Children		
Poor Relationship with Children	3	3
Fear of Other Children	1	0
	4	3
Habits		
Stuttering	1	0
Enuresis	4	0
Nail-biting	0	1
Thumb-sucking	0	1
	5	2
Miscellaneous		
Sex Experience	0	2
"Odd" Behavior	1	1
Physical Symtons, no basis	1	1
Hysteria	1	0
	3	4
TOTAL	96	24

most important to the child. For example, defiant behavior, which directly affected the parents in relation to the children, was given more often as a problem among the boys than was "a poor relationship with other children", although it developed that a large proportion of the boys were maladjusted in this respect. It is interesting that in no case was masturbation indicated to be a problem, although this habit was very common among the children in the study group, and in some cases was so serious as to be of major importance.

Obviously, most of the children referred to the clinic presented more than one problem. The referring persons indicated a total of ninety-six problems among the forty-two boys studied, and twenty-four problems, or one quarter as many, among the seventeen girls. These ranged in type and degree from "nail-biting" to "breaking and entering", and from "shyness" to serious homosexual activity.

It is interesting that, in the referrals, no boy was described specifically as a "sissy" or as "effeminate", and no girl was designated as a "tomboy" or as "masculine". However, the referral problems are of considerable significance to this study. The author was unable to secure a report of the frequency of different types of problems among the general clinic population, but it is possible to compare the problems presented by the two groups.

Nineteen of the boys presented problems included under the heading of "poor school work", but none of the girls was

referred for this reason. Considering the relatively high intelligence level of both groups, this would at least seem to indicate that the girls were more adequate than the boys in the school situation. Six boys and four girls presented problems listed under the heading of "aggressive personality characteristics", but, in proportion to the total number of problems for each group, nearly three times as many girls as boys showed these characteristics. That is, approximately seventeen per cent of the girls' problems were included in this aggressive personality group, as compared with approximately six per cent of the boys in the same group.

In the "aggressive behavior" and "passive behavior" problems groups, the proportion of boys and girls was fairly equal, with a slightly larger number of boys in the first group and a slightly larger proportion of girls in the second.

Of particular interest to this study is the large group of referral problems under the heading of "passive personality characteristics", which includes many difficulties which seeme to indicate a reaction to the social situation of inadequacy, withdrawal, or submissiveness. Twelve-and-one-half per cent of the girls exhibited this type of reaction, as compared with slightly more than twenty-eight per cent among the boys: in other words, this rather passive type of maladjustment to the social situation was indicated to be more than twice as frequent in the boys' as in the girls' group.

Considering the remaining problem groupings, the girls seemed to be less well-adjusted than the boys to other children, and a slightly larger proportion of girls presented problems included under "habits" and "miscellaneous".

In summary of the frequency of different types of problems among the boys and the girls, it can be said that a larger proportion of boys were referred because of poor school work, aggressive behavior, and passive personality characteristics, and a larger proportion of girls were referred because of aggressive personality charcteristics, passive behavior, poor adjustments to children, poor habits, and miscellaneous problems. It should be noted that the difference in proportion between the girls' and the boys' problems was largest in problem groupings of school adjustment, aggressive and passive personality characteristics, and adjustments to other children.

Although no children of the clinic group were referred specifically because they seemed to be confused as to their sex roles, the problems described at the time of referral seem to be of considerable significance to the subject of this study.

CHAPTER V

Results of the Study

The general conclusions of the investigation are summarized in Table III. Of the fifty boys considered in the study, thirty-one, or sixty-two per cent, were effeminate; six, or twelve per cent, were doubtful; and thirteen, or twenty-six per cent, were masculine. Among the fifty girls the proportions were very similar: twenty-nine, or fifty-eight per cent, were masculine; six, or twelve per cent, were doubtful; fifteen, or thirty per cent, were feminine.

TABLE III

Masculinity and Femininity of the Study Group

Conclusions	Number of Boys	Number of Girls
Feminine	31	15
Doubtful	6	6
Masculine	13	29
Total	50	50

The above figures, however, do not indicate in how many family units the roles of the boys and girls were completely reversed. That is, it is not to be inferred that, in the twenty-nine families in which the girls were masculine, all the boys in these same families were effeminate. With each

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK
LIBRARY

sex group divided into three categories, it is apparent that there were nine possible combinations of traits. These combinations, along with the number of sibling-couples included in each, are represented in Table IV.

It will be noted that the boy was effeminate and the girl was masculine - a complete reversal of the supposedly "normal" situation - in twenty-three of the fifty families. The boy was masculine and the girl feminine - the "normal" condition - in only ten of the families. The remaining seventeen sibling-couples were distributed among the other possible combinations, with the exception that in no family was the boy masculine and the girl doubtful. It is interesting, and perhaps significant, that the couples exhibited similar personality patterns - that is, both masculine or both feminine - in only fourteen per cent of the total family units. In four families the boy and the girl were both feminine, and in three families they were both masculine.

A major consideration of this study was to determine whether the personalities of the parents was an influencing factor on the masculinity and femininity of the children. One aspect of this which the author thought to be of importance was the question of which parent seemed to be most dominant in the home, especially in relation to the children. In deciding upon this, several factors were taken into consideration: the aggressiveness exhibited by the parents; the adequacy of the parents in business and social relationships;

TABLE IV

Relationship of Parent-Dominancy to Masculinity and Femininity of Siblings

Sibling Combinations	Dominating Parent in Home: Mother Dominant	Father Dominant	Doubtful	Total	Percentage
Boy Effeminate Girl Masculine	20		3	23	46
Boy Effeminate Girl Doubtful	1		3	4	8
Boy Effeminate Girl Feminine	4			4	8
Boy Doubtful Girl Masculine	2		1	3	6
Boy Doubtful Girl Doubtful		1	1	2	4
Boy Doubful Girl Feminine	1			1	2
Boy Masculine Girl Masculine	2		1	3	6
Boy Masculine Girl Doubtful				0	0
Boy Masculine Girl Feminine	1	3	6	10	20
TOTAL	31	4	15	50	
PERCENTAGE	62	8	30		100

the division, between the parents, of responsibility for the training and discipline of the children; obviously inflexible and restrictive attitudes on the part of a parent; the attitudes of the parents toward each other; observations of both parents by the social worker. By correlating these various factors, the author concluded that the mother was the more dominating parent in thirty-one families,[1] and the father was more dominating in four families.[2] No decision was made in fifteen cases. This resulted for one of two reasons: either there was too little information on one or both of the parents to warrant a decision, or the parents seemed to share equally in the responsibilities of family life. The nine families which were broken by divorce, separation, or the death of one parent were included in the"doubtful" group. Although the remaining parent obviously carried full responsibility in the home, it was difficult to ascertain what the role of the other parent had been in the family.

The relationship between the dominancy of the parents and the feminine-doubtful-masculine groupings is given in Table IV. Most significant is the relationship between the dominancy of the mothers and the group of children in which the sexual roles were completely reversed. The mother was the dominating parent in twenty of the twenty-three families in

---

1 For example, see Illustrative Cases One and Four.
2 For example, see Illustrative Case Three.

which the boy was effeminate and the girl was masculine, and the remaining three sibling-couples were in families where the parent-dominancy was doubtful. Thus, none of these twenty-three sibling couples was from a home in which the father was the dominant parent. In addition, of the ten couples in which the boy was masculine and the girl feminine, only one was in a home dominated by the mother; three of these "normal" couples were in three of the four homes in which the father was dominant. The remaining six couples were in homes in which the parent-dominancy was doubtful.

Another question for consideration in this study was whether the masculinity and femininity of the children was influenced by the following two factors: the sex of the older child, and the age range between the two children. The influence of these factors is indicated in Table V. The one family containing a set of twins is not included.

In the forty-nine families, twenty-nine of the boys and twenty of the girls were older. The difference in ages ranged from one to eight years. In twenty-two of the twenty-nine families in which the boys were older, and in eighteen of the twenty families where the girl was older, the difference in ages was from one to four years, inclusive.

It is apparent, in Table V, that a larger proportion of boys were effeminate in the families where the girls were older. In the twenty families in which the girl was older, fifteen of the boys, or seventy-five per cent, were effeminate,

TABLE V

Relationship of the Age Range Between the Siblings to Masculinity and Femininity[a]

Older Child and Age Range Between Siblings	Conclusions about Boys			Conclusions about Girls			TOTAL FAMILIES
	Effeminate	Doubtful	Masculine	Masculine	Doubtful	Feminine	
Boy Older							
1-2 years	6	1	2	7	1	1	9
3-4 years	6	3	4	6	1	6	13
5-6 years	3		2	3	1	1	5
7 years and over	1		1	1		1	2
Total	16	4	9	17	3	9	29
Girl Older							
1-2 years	8			6		2	8
3-4 years	5	1	4	4	2	4	10
5-6 years	2			2			2
7 years and over							0
Total	15	1	4	12	2	6	20

a One set of twins not included.

four were masculine, and one was doubtful. In the twenty-nine families where the boys were older, sixteen of the boys, or fifty-five per cent, were effeminate, nine were masculine, and four were doubtful. These figures may be compared with the general results for the group of fifty boys, which indicated that sixty-two per cent of the boys, irrespective of the home situation, were effeminate.

Unlike the situation that was found among the boys, the girls were apparently not affected by the matter of which sibling was the older. In the twenty-nine families in which the boy was older, seventeen of the girls, or fifty-nine per cent, were masculine, nine were feminine, and three were doubtful. Twenty of the girls were older than the boys, and, of these, twelve, or sixty per cent, were masculine, six were feminine, and two were doubtful. These figures are similar to the results for the total group of fifty girls, of which fifty-eight per cent were masculine.

The results as given in Table V seem to indicate that the masculinity and femininity of the children is influenced to a certain extent by the age range between them. In the nine families in which the boy was one or two years older, six of the boys were effeminate and only two were masculine, and seven of the girls were masculine and only one was feminine. The girl was one or two years older in eight families, and in these all the boys were effeminate and six of the eight girls were masculine. The relative proportion of femininity in boys

and masculinity in girls seemed to decrease as the age range between them widened, although the number of cases in which the sibling was five or more years older was too small to justify a conclusion on the matter. An interesting fact occurs in the cases where either the boy or the girl was three or four years older than the sibling. In these families, the number of effeminate and masculine boys was approximately the same, and the number of masculine and feminine girls balanced exactly. In fact, eight of the thirteen masculine boys and ten of the fifteen masculine girls were in these groups.

Table VI shows the influence of the age range between the children and the sex of the older child on the sibling-combination. These results emphasize the effect of the girl being the older child in the family. Of the twenty sibling couples in which the girl was the older sibling, eleven, or fifty-five percent, were in the boy effeminate - girl masculine group. In the twenty-nine sibling couples in which the boy was older than the girl, only twelve, or forty-one per cent, showed a complete reversal of their sexual roles.

Of the seven sibling couples living with their mothers, the sexual roles were completely reversed - boy effeminate, girl masculine - in five cases; both were effeminate in one family; in the seventh case, both were doubtful. Both siblings were "normal" - boy masculine, girl feminine - in the one family in which the father was the remaining parent, and in the one family containing the father and a step-mother.

TABLE VI

Relationship of the Age Range to the Sibling-Combinations[a]

Sibling Combinations	Number Years Boys Older				Number Years Girls Older				Total
	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 and over	1-2	3-4	5-6	7 and over	
Boy Effeminate Girl Masculine	5	4	2	1	6	3	2		23
Boy Effeminate Girl Doubtful	1		1			2			4
Boy Effeminate Girl Feminine		2			2				4
Boy Doubtful Girl Masculine	1	1				1			3
Boy Doubtful Girl Doubtful		1							1
Boy Doubtful Girl Feminine		1							1
Boy Masculine Girl Masculine	1	1	1						3
Boy Masculine Girl Doubtful									0
Boy Masculine Girl Feminine	1	3	1	1		4			10
TOTAL	9	13	5	2	8	10	2	0	49

a One set of twins, both doubtful, not included.

It is interesting that the only family in the study in which the father was the remaining parent, and the only family in which there was a step-mother, included two of the ten "normal" sibling couples.

This chapter has given the bare results of the study of fifty family units containing one boy and one girl. The following chapter summarizes the results and includes some possible interpretations.

CHAPTER VI

Summary and Conclusions

It should be remembered, when considering the results of this study, that society establishes certain standards of masculine and feminine behavior, and expects the individuals of each sex to conform to these standards. The enormous pressure of group opinion enforces these standards and makes any deviation from them extremely difficult and painful. Hence, any proportion, of a specific group, that deviates from the established standards of masculinity and femininity need not be a large majority of that group to be of major significance.

The results of this study at least partially substantiate the observations of Dr. Deutsch and the mother of one of the sibling-couples. The sexual roles of the children were completely reversed in more than twice as many families as the number in which the children were both "normal". From these results, and considering the relatively small number of cases studied, it obviously can not be stated as a certainty that, in families containing only one boy and one girl, the boy will necessarily be effeminate and the girl masculine. However, considering that the mores of society prescribe a certain "masculine" personality for boys and "feminine" personality for girls, and expect every child to conform to these patterns, this large proportion of complete reversals is extreme-

ly significant.

Apart from the question of the sexual roles of both children being completely reversed in families of this configuration, the evidence is very strong that there is likely to be a confusion of sex in at least one of the children. Of the total group of children, a large majority of the boys were effeminate, and a large majority of the girls were masculine. The number of masculine boys and feminine girls was relatively small. Of the fifty families considered, both children were "normal" in only ten families, or one-fifth of the total number. In the other four-fifths of the families, there was a greater or lesser degree of confusion as to their sexual roles in one or both children.

Besides the main consideration, four questions were propounded in Chapter I, pertaining to the influence on the masculinity - femininity of the children of the following factors: the personality of the parents, which child was the older, the age range between the children, and broken homes. The author believes that this study has provided at least tentative answers to these questions.

The most suggestive correlation is that between parent-dominancy and the masculinity and femininity of the children. The mother was the dominant parent in nearly all of the families where parent-dominancy could be determined, and nearly all the sibling couples whose sexual roles were completely reversed were from homes dominated by the mother.

The obvious conclusion from these facts is that the dominancy of the mother in large part determines the children's confusion in their sexual roles. This conclusion is emphasized by the fact that, in three of the four families in which the father seemed to be the most important figure, both children were "normal" - boy masculine and girl feminine - and six of the ten "normal" sibling-couples were in the families in which the parent-dominancy was doubtful. The evidence is inescapable that the boy is more likely to be effeminate and the girl is more likely to be masculine when the mother is the dominating parent in the home.

In reference to the questions of which child was the older and the age range between the children, the results indicate that the boy was more likely to be effeminate if the girl was the older of the two children, but the degree of masculinity in the girls was approximately the same regardless of which child was older. The possibility of confusion in the sexual roles was greatest when the girl was one or two years older than the boy. The relative proportion of effeminacy in the boys and masculinity in the girls apparently decreased as the age range widened.

Although the number of broken families considered in the study was small, it is perhaps significant that a disproportionately large number of sibling-couples showing a complete reversal of the sexual roles were in the families where the mother was the remaining parent. This evidently rein-

forces the conclusions as to the effect of mother-dominancy. Both children were "normal" in the one family including a step-mother and in the one family in which the father was the remaining parent.

The author is aware that, due to the relatively small number of cases studied and the necessary limitations described in Chapter I, the present study is by no means definitive, and the results obtained can be applied only with considerable caution to other similar situations. Other studies might well be made which would throw more light on this subject. For example, a careful study of the personality manifestations of a large, unselected group of boys and girls would indicate whether or not most of them conformed to the socially acceptable definitions of masculinity and femininity. Considering that this study has shown the important effect of the mother being the dominating parent, more detailed studies of the personalities of the parents in relation to the masculinity and femininity of their children would be helpful. In addition, the number of cases considered in this study was too few to provide conclusive evidence as to the influence of the age range between the siblings and broken homes, and additional studies of larger groups might clarify the importance of these factors.

APPENDIX I

Schedule

A Study of Masculinity and Femininity
in Children of Families
Containing One Boy and One Girl

Case Number: Date of Study: 1941 - 1942

Name of Child Studied: Birthdate: Sex: Race:

Age at Referral: School Grade: Intelligence Quotient:

Reason for Referral: Date Referred: Length Time Studied:

Reason for Closing:

Sibling's Name: Birthdate: Sex: School Grade:

Referred to Clinic: Date of Referral: Reason for Referral:

Length Time Studied: Reason for Closing: Intelligence Quotient

Parents:

Age of Mother: Age of Father: Marital Status:

Personality of Mother: Personality of Father:

Attitude of Father toward Boy:

Attitude of Father toward Girl:

Attitude of Mother toward Boy:

Attitude of Mother toward Girl:

Male Sibling

Health History:

Female Sibling

Health History:

Schedule (Continued)

(Male Sibling)	(Female Sibling)
Adjustment to Sibling:	Adjustment to Sibling:
Interests:	Interests:
Athletics:	Athletics:
Games:	Games:
Expressed Ambitions:	Expressed Ambitions:
Other Interests:	Other Interests:
Adjustments to Boys:	Adjustments to Boys:
Adjustments to Girls:	Adjustments to Girls:
Adjustments to Mixed Groups:	Adjustments to Mixed Groups:
Adjustments to Mother:	Adjustments to Mother:
Adjustments to Father:	Adjustments to Father:

Description of each sibling's personality by parents, teacher, social worker, psychiatrists, psychologists, etc.:

Behavior, habits, etc. of Boy:	Behavior, habits, etc. of girl:
School Adjustment:	School Adjustment:
Conclusions:	Conclusions:
Effeminate:	Masculine:
Doubtful:	Doubtful:
Masculine:	Feminine:
Remarks:	Remarks:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

English, O. Spurgeon, and Pearson, Gerald, Common Neuroses of Children and Adults, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1937.

Flugel, J. C., The Psycho-Analytic Study of the Family, New York: The International Psycho-Analytic Press, 1921.

Freud, Sigmund, The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud, New York: The Modern Library, 1938. Book III.

Healy, William, and Bronner, Augusta F., Treatment and What Happened Afterward, Boston: Judge Baker Guidance Center, 1939.

Mead, Margaret, Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1935.

Sayles, Mary B., The Problem Child at Home, New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1928.

Sumner, William G., Folkways, Boston: Ginn and Company, 1940 Chapter IX.

White, William A., The Mental Hygiene of Childhood, Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1923.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Continued)

Articles

Brierly, Margaret, "Some Problems of Integration in Women," The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis, 13:433-448, October, 1932.

Dicks, G. H., and Childers, A.T., "The Social Transformation of a Boy Who Had Lived His First Fourteen Years as a Girl," American Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, 4:508-517, October, 1934.

Maeder, Leroy M. A., "Diagnostic Criteria - The Concept of Normal and Abnormal," The Family, 6:171-179, October, 1941.

Markey, O. B.,and Noble, Helen, "An Evaluation of the Masculinity Factor in Boarding Home Situations," American Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, 6:258-267, April, 1936.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02481 3794